

Response dated 13 April 2005 to Office Action mailed 13 January 2005

Page 2 of 5

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, as amended by the Amendment filed 16 March 2004 are pending.

The Office Action cites the combination of Shively (US 5,857,209) and Buis et al. (US 6,631,007) in relation to claims 1-10.

As pointed out in the remarks that accompanied the Amendment filed on 16 March 2004, Shively fails to teach or suggest the combinations of the independent claims of this application. Those claims recite both "an ordered set having a plurality of positions" and "an imposition plan defining a layout of pages for one or more print sheets, the layout specifying a plurality of page locations on the print sheets". Positions in the ordered set are associated with the page locations of the imposition plan. Individual pages are assigned indirectly to the imposition plan by assigning the pages to positions in the ordered set.

The Office Action (paragraph 1) is incorrect to indicate that Shively discloses both "creating an imposition description file" and "creating an ordered set having multiple positions" and "assigning the individual pages of the document to the pages of the ordered set in a reader order defined by a user".

Shively, as understood, discloses a method which involves providing a PostScript file (14) containing page descriptions of a number of pages (12) and providing an instruction set (25). The instruction set (25) indicates which pages (12) should be printed from file (14) and where on a flat (24) those pages should be printed. (Col. 4, ln. 49-52).

This is in contrast to claim 1 which reads:

1. A method for formatting a document having individual pages in preparation for printing the individual pages on a media sheet, the method comprising:
 - storing the individual pages of the document in a data file;
 - creating an imposition description file defined by a user;
 - creating an imposition plan based on the imposition description file the imposition plan defining a layout of pages for one or more print sheets, the layout specifying a plurality of page locations on the print sheets;
 - creating an ordered set having multiple positions;

Response dated 13 April 2005 to Office Action mailed 13 January 2005

Page 3 of 5

assigning the individual pages of the document to the positions of the ordered set in a reader order defined by a user; and
associating the positions in the ordered set of pages to the page locations of the imposition plan, the layout of the individual pages in the imposition plan being arranged for printing on the media sheet.

Claim 1 requires *inter alia* a data file containing pages of a document, an imposition plan having page locations, and an ordered set that has positions. Individual pages can be assigned to the positions of the ordered set. The positions of the ordered set can be associated with the page locations of the imposition plan. The claimed imposition plan is not the same as the claimed ordered set.

As previously pointed out, Shively's instruction set (25) cannot be equated with the claimed ordered set because it does not have any positions which are associated with page locations in a layout of a separate imposition plan, as claimed. Shively's instruction set (25) itself specifies a layout indicating where on the flat (24) each page is to be rendered (see e.g. col. 4, ln. 49-52 and col. 8, ln. 39-42). Each line of instruction set (25) refers to an imposition procedure. However, an imposition procedure is not an imposition plan. An imposition procedure merely specifies translation, rotation and/or scaling that can be applied to a page (col. 8, ln. 58-9). None of the imposition procedures define "a layout of pages for one or more print sheets" as claimed. The excerpts from column 4 referred to in the Office Action do not teach the combination of claim 1.

In particular:

- instruction set (25) cannot be both the claimed imposition plan and the claimed ordered set;
- col. 4, ln. 58-67 describes providing certain procedures in an interpreter. These procedures are not an imposition plan. Downloading these procedures into an interpreter does not constitute associating positions in an ordered set with page locations of an imposition plan.

Buis et al. fails to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Shively.

Therefore, claim 1 is submitted to patentably distinguish the cited combination of Shively and Buis et al. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be patentable for at least this reason.

Response dated 13 April 2005 to Office Action mailed 13 January 2005

Page 4 of 5

Claim 5 includes features similar to those discussed above in relation to claim 1. Therefore, claim 5, and claims 6-8 which depend from claim 5 are submitted to patentably distinguish the cited combination of Shively and Buis et al.

The Office Action suggests that Shively col. 7 ln. 66 to col. 8, ln. 61 describes associating positions in a pageset with the imposition plan. The Applicant submits that this is incorrect. This portion of Shively describes instruction set (25). Shively does not disclose associating positions in instruction set (25) with a separate imposition plan. The Applicant further points out that claim 5 recites "associating the positions in the pageset with the page locations of the imposition plan".

Claim 9 reads as follows:

9. A method for formatting a document having individual pages in preparation for printing the individual pages on a media sheet, the method comprising:
- using a software object to represent an imposition plan based on an imposition description file, the imposition plan defining a layout of pages for one or more print sheets, the layout specifying a plurality of page locations on the print sheets;
 - using another software object to represent an ordered set having multiple positions;
 - associating the individual pages of the document to the positions of the ordered set in a reader order defined by a user; and
 - associating the positions in the ordered set to the page locations of the imposition plan.

For the reasons discussed above, the combination of Shively and Buis et al. fails to disclose or suggest "associating the individual pages of the document to the positions of the ordered set in a reader order defined by a user; and associating the positions in the ordered set to the page locations of the imposition plan" in the context of claim 9.

Therefore, claim 9 is submitted to be patentable over the cited combination of Shively and Buis et al.

Claim 10 reads as follows:

Response dated 13 April 2005 to Office Action mailed 13 January 2005

Page 5 of 5

10. A computer system including a computer-readable medium having an imposition description file stored therein, said file including the pages of a document, a reader order for the pages and an imposition for formatting the document in preparation for printing the individual pages on a media sheet, and computer software residing in computer memory including:
- one software object representing an imposition plan based on the imposition description file, the imposition plan defining a layout of pages for one or more print sheets, the layout specifying a plurality of page locations on the print sheets;
 - one software object representing an ordered set having multiple positions;
 - computer executable instructions for assigning the individual pages of the document to the positions of the ordered set; and
 - computer executable instructions for associating the positions in the ordered set to the imposition plan, the layout of the individual pages in the imposition plan being arranged for printing on the media sheet.

For the reasons above, the Applicant submits that Shively in combination with Buis et al. fails to disclose or suggest "one software object representing an ordered set having multiple positions; computer executable instructions for assigning the individual pages of the document to the positions of the ordered set; and computer executable instructions for associating the positions in the ordered set to the imposition plan" in the context of claim 10.

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that all of claims 1-10 patentably distinguish the combination of Shively and Buis et al. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested. If the Examiner finds any of the above remarks unclear or if the Examiner believes that the foregoing does not adequately address all of the issues in the Office Action then the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the Applicant's agent Gavin N. Manning at (604) 669-3432 (ext. 9043).

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Richard A. Johnson
Registration No. 56,080
tel: 604.669.3432 ext. 9043
fax: 604.681.4081
e-mail: GNMDocket@patentable.com

Vancouver, B.C.
CANADA

- 5 -

@FFDesktop\ODMA\Inradoc\12734131405002r